UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

HERBERT E. KNUDSON,

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

ORDER

(Motion for Clarification—#18)

Plaintiff(s),

Defendant(s).

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification of Motion to Dismiss Judgement (#18, filed November 9, 2010). The motion will be summarily denied, there being no need to await a response from the Defendants.

The original complaint was filed January 29, 2010, but was dismissed with leave to amend on February 8, 2010. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on March 8, 2010. Thereafter there followed Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#6), Motion for Summary Judgment (#9), and Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment (#14). On November 3, 2010, this Court entered a written Order (#16) granting the Motion to Dismiss, denying the Motion for Summary Judgment and denying the Motion for Default Judgment. The Order is four pages long.

Judgment of dismissal was entered on November 3, 2010.

26 ////

1	Plaintiff now brings the present Motion for Clarification which, in totality, states:
2	"(A/What was the reason for dismissal
3	"(1) Not filed in time.
4	"(2) Failed to State Claim, etc.
5	"(3) Judgement.
6	Did not Serve Defendants (no
7	(2) time-[unreadable] at the court."
8	The Motion is unclear, but if Plaintiff is asking the Court to explain its reason for
9	dismissing the case, the Court has more than adequately done so in its Order (#16) and will not
10	merely repeat what it said there. Order (#16) is abundantly clear and needs no clarification.
11	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification of Motion
12	to Dismiss Judgement (#18) is DENIED.
13	Dated: November 16, 2010.
14	1 Alash
15	Roger D. Huyt
16	Chief United States District Judge
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	